



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,727	08/08/2006	Takuo Suzuki	129039	2417
25944	7590	04/21/2010	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				SASTRI, SATYA B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1796
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
04/21/2010			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com  
jarmstrong@oliff.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/588,727	SUZUKI ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
SATYA B. SASTRI	1796	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** 71

- (1) SATYA B. SASTRI. (3) \_\_\_\_.  
 (2) Mr. Richard Castellano. (4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 19 April 2010

**Time:** 11.30am

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Satya B Sastri/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1796

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney was contacted to discuss possible claim amendment. It was noted that (1) claim 1 as amended lacks clarity because the claim language recites the matrix as comprising an acrylic copolymer (A) (i.e. in singular form) while the newly added limitation drawn to "the major constitutional polymer of the acrylic copolymer" suggests a copolymer blend. It was noted that even though the specification defines the acrylic copolymer (A) as including a copolymer derived from two or more monomers or a blend of two or more acrylic homopolymers or a blend of two or more acrylic copolymers, the newly added limitation is restrictive to the scenario where blends are involved but is not meaningful when an acrylic copolymer is derived from two or more monomers. As such, the specification does not recite that the copolymer may be block copolymer and therefore, the limitation "major constitutional polymer of the acrylic copolymer" raises potential 112 indefiniteness issues. Possible amendment was suggested to define the acrylic copolymer as defined in the specification and further amending the claim language. Additionally, (2) it was noted in view of the newly found art to McGarry (US 4, 478,963), incorporating limitations from claim 5 into claim 1 would potentially place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant's attorney indicated that the proposed amendment would be considered upon consultation with the client and that the examiner would be notified by 4/22/10.